DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 102 702 EA 006 823

AUTHOR Snyderwine, L. Thomas
TITLE The Introduction of an Intra-Departmental Supervisory Program at Cathedral Prep.
PUB DATE 28 Jun 73
NOTE 36p.; Submitted in partial fulfillment of Ed.D. requirements, Nova University

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Administration; *School Supervision; Secondary Education; Supervision; *Supervisory Activities; *Supervisory Methods

ABSTRACT

The goal of this practicum was to create a formal supervisory program where there had been none previously. After considering several supervisory alternatives, an intradepartmental, colleagal approach was selected. This approach permits teachers to judge their performance according to established teaching patterns and to share classroom techniques and styles with each other in a nonthreatening atmosphere. The results of the practicum were positive. (Author/DW)

17

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

JUL 9 - 1973

ED102702

# THE INTRODUCTION OF AN INTRA-DEPARTMENTAL SUPERVISORY PROGRAM AT CATHEDRAL PREP

by

Rev. Father L. Thomas Snyderwine

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of Doctor
of Education, Nova University

Erie, PA
William E. Bryan, Ed. D.
Cluster Co-ordinator

Midi-Practicum
Supervision and Evaluation
June 28, 1973

EA 006 823

TABLE OF CONTENTS


Abstract. . . . . (i)

Introduction. . . . . (ii)

The Need for Improvement of Instruction. . . . . 1

The Rationale. . . . . 1

Possible Methods of Supervision. . . . . 2

Method for Cathedral Prep. . . . . 3

Time Span. . . . . 3

Checklists. . . . . 5

Conferences. . . . . 8

Sequential Plan of Action. . . . . 9

Results. . . . . 10

Professional Profile of Participants. . . . . 11

Reliability of Observational Checklists. . . . . 12

Feedback Checklists. . . . . 15a

Recommendation to the Adm. . . . . 19

Bibliography. . . . . 21

ABSTRACT

The goal of this practicum was to innovate a formal supervisory program at Cathedral Prep. Until now, there has been no stated policy of this kind in the Prep program. Thus a very vital source of professional growth has been missing. Several supervisory alternatives were considered. An intradepartmental, colleagal approach was determined to be the most feasible method to permit the teachers to see their own performance in the light of some established good teaching patterns and to allow them to share classroom approaches and styles with each other, all in a very non-threatening atmosphere. Evaluation of the instruments used in the experiment showed positive results, indicating the merit in repeating the procedure on a regular basis. The conceptual plan of action for this project can easily be implemented by anyone considering the expansion of a supervisory program.

## INTRODUCTION

At Cathedral Prep, there is no stated policy of supervision in the faculty handbook or in any other source of established procedure at the school. Hence, a very vital source of professional growth and feedback has been lacking from the Prep program.

Of all the possible methods of supervision that could be used in the Prep program, the one that appears to be the most feasible is the colleagal, teachers-supervise-teachers style. The purpose of this method is two-fold: (1) To help teachers see their strong and weak points and to provide occasions (2) wherein teachers can share classroom approaches and teaching techniques. The scope is within a given academic department, Prep's theology department for this experiment.

In order to accomplish these goals, a series of checklists were designed and given to the participants to facilitate their observations and sharing experiences. The experiment was divided into two stages with a time limit set for each stage. In addition, both pre-and post-conferences were held by the participants to insure their maximum understanding and accomplishment of the program, its purposes, and goals. All the elements fell into a sequential plan of action that could easily be duplicated in other similar conditions or in other departments.

At the conclusion of each stage of the experiment, the checklists were returned to the practitioner (this writer) for evaluation, both formative and summative. Positive and negative reactions from the participants were noted as well as their specific comments on what they

learned in the conference phases of the program. These evaluation then became the framework of the recommendation made to the Prep administration for the future use of this intra-departmental supervisory experience.

# THE INTRODUCTION OF AN INTRA-DEPARTMENTAL SUPERVISORY PROGRAM AT CATHEDRAL PREP

By Rev. Father L. Thomas Snyderwine*

## THE NEED FOR IMPROVEMENT OF INSTRUCTION

### Rationale

A professional program of instruction should have built in it methods of evaluation and means which can precipitate improvement of that program. According to general research, many schools either lack such a program or experience great difficulties in implementing such a program. One likely explanation of this phenomenon could be a school's (administration and/or faculty) local lack of understanding of the purposes and processes of educational supervision. Yet, if a school is to retain its professionalism, it must necessarily have as an integral part of its program the most affective procedures of formative evaluation possible.

Stress is given to the formative aspect of the evaluation. Education is a process involving human beings in a constant state of change. Therefore, the evaluation of the process cannot be static, lest it severely stunt the progress of the process of change. In other words, the evaluation in education must constantly be recurrent and constantly be evaluated.[1]

---

*Associate in Curriculum Development Program, Cathedral Prep School, Erie, PA, school census: 1200 boys.

[1] Harold P. Adams, and Frank G. Dickey, Basic Principles of Supervision (New York: American Book Co., 1953), p.271.

Cathedral Prep School, where this practicum has taken place, has neither teacher evaluative instruments now instruction-improvement programs as a stated part of its operation. In perspective, however, the school does enjoy and has enjoyed during its fifty-two year history a very high Middle States rating. The problem is that the only teacher evaluative instruments that Prep has access to are those of the Middle States evaluative criterea, and the only instruction-improvement program it engages in is that related to the Middle States re-evaluation every ten years. The point is that there is no on-going, recurring formal effort at improvement of instruction. It is this problem to which this practicum addresses itself.

## POSSIBLE METHODS OF SUPERVISION

Several methods of supervision could be applicable to this problem at Cathedral Prep. The headmaster and/or dean of studies could do the actual supervision. A supervising educational expert could be hired. The heads of the academic departments could supervise the faculty in their own departments. Or, the faculty could supervise each other.

As far as the headmaster and/or dean of studies doing the actual supervising, this solution would be impractical due to the already crowded job description of both men. The second alternative, hiring a supervisor, would be financially impossible due to the tightness of the Prep budget (Prep being a Catholic school). The third alternative, the heads of the academic departments supervising the faculty in their own departments, would also be impractical because according to the Prep scheduling, department heads teach as many hours in the day (5 out of 7) as do regular faculty.

This leaves the last alternative, faculty supervising each other, as the most practical method to innovate a formal and recurring instruction improvement program at Prep.

To make a beginning in this effort and to establish and test a format for this faculty-supervision-of-itself, this practitioner chose one academic department as a manageable group for experiment. The department of theology was chosen as the initial test area because the practitioner was a member of that department and could obtain the constructive cooperation of the other faculty in that department. The intention was to introduce an intra-departmental observation and supervision program engaged in by all members of the department on a colleagal, non-threatening, technique sharing basis. The hope was that such form of supervision could at least help a teacher to view his teaching practice in light of some established good teaching habits and then to serve as a clearinghouse for the exchange of ideas and classroom approaches, all for the improvement of instruction.[2] If, then, the evaluation of this initial supervisory attempt proved positive, the conceptual design of this program would be recommended to the school's administration to be made a part of the stated operational procedure for other departments within the school.

Time Span

The amount of time the faculty needed to do the observations and to hold the pre - and post - conferences with each other was estimated by the practitioner to be two weeks. The rationale for this estimation was that the faculty should be given sufficient time to study the checklists, arrange with each other for a good class-day to observe,

---

[2] Dr. Gary E. Pittenger, Educational Supervision. (Fort Lauderdale, Fla.,: Nova University, Independent Study Guide), pp. 162-163.

do the observation, fill out the forms, hold the conferences, and return the forms to the practitioner for evaluation. Two weeks seemed to be a comfortable space of time for these tasks; each participant was to observe only one other member of the department. However, in the first round of these observations, i.e., during the third quarter of the school year, the designated two week span elapsed and only three faculty had completed the process. The cause of the delay was a combination of faculty procrastination and school activities crowding into the schedule. Thus, it took much cajoling on the part of the practitioner to eventually get all faculty observations and conferences completed before the end of the third quarter and the start of the second (4th quarter) round of observations. In fact, as it turned out, only five out of the seven members of the department participated at all. Initially the practitioner had the cooperative support of all seven, but last minute changes of schedule and an increase of duties caused two members to be unable to participate in the first round of observations.

In order to offset the contingencies of school activities, procrastination, schedule shifts, and the increase of duties, the practitioner decided to allow only one week for the second (4th quarter) round of observations and required conferences. The theory behind this reduction was that the smallness of time designated would heighten the urgency for completion. In addition, the classes-to-be-observed were actually indicated except for the specific day by the practitioner on the checklists, thus saving the participants some pre-conference time and decisions. This 4th quarter approach worked rather well with only two of the seven participants being just a couple days late returning the completed forms.

The issue of the time-spans has been treated first in this report simply because it turned into a major difficulty when it otherwise could have been rather simple. The practitioner learned that greater success was attained when the time-span was kept short and more specific direction was given. In addition, another theory evolved: most likely the process could have been completed without all the "arm-bending" if it initially had administrative demand rather than only administrative permission.

The Checklists

In order to help a teacher to view his teaching practice in the light of some established good teaching habits, and then to provide a basis for the exchange of ideas and classroom approaches between observer and observee, the practitioner designed a series of checklists that were distributed with explanations (by way of conference) to the participants prior to the observations.

The rationale used in constructing the checklists was taken from the following ideas of Dr. Gary E. Pittenger in his supervision studyguide for the Nova University Off-Campus Ed. D. Program.[3] Here he states that there is no one pre-fabricated instrument that is sufficient to gauge every hypothetically important feature of teaching performance. Thus, while supervisory personnel should be knowledgeable of the existing instruments, they nevertheless would further serve their faculty's needs by being able to invent observational instruments that would account for the specific needs of specific faculty.

---

[3] Pittenger, p. 130.

With this reasoning in mind the practitioner consulted the observational instruments located in the following sources:

1. Jane Franseth, Supervision as Leadership (Evanston, Ill,: Row, Peterson, and Company), pp. 274-275.

2. Dwight E. Beecher, The Evaluation of Teaching (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1949), pp. 9-13, 69-72.

3. J. Minor Gwynn, Theory and Practice of Supervision (New York: Dodd, Mead, & Company, 1961), p. 419.

4. A.S. Barr, et. al., Teacher Effectiveness (Madison, Wisconsin: Dembar Publications, Inc., 1961), p. 102.

5. Arthur W. Combs, "The Personal Approach to Good Teaching," Educational Leadership, XXI (March, 1964), 369-377.

The factors that were selected from these sources were the ones that seemed pertinent to the performance of Prep's theology faculty. Hence, the above five sources become the objective criteria establishing the construct validity of face validity of the practitioner's checklists.

Garrett, in his book on statistics in the fields of psychology and education, sets down the principles for test validity. He states that a test is face valid when it appears to measure what the author thought he was measuring. Furthermore, the validity of the components of the test is determined experimentally by observing the correlation between the test and some independent criterion. "A criterion may be an objective measure of performance, or a qualitative measure such as a judgment of the character or excellence of work done."[4] The above-listed five sources for the checklists are the bases for the objective measures of performance and qualitative measures that Garrett calls for.

---

[4] Henry E. Garrett, Statistics in Psychology and Education, 5th ed. (New York: David McKay, Co., Inc., 1965), p. 355.

The following then are the observational and feedback checklists designed for the Cathedral Prep intra-departmental supervisory program. These are the checklists used for round #2 of the observations. Round #1's checklists did not contain the last item on the feedback checklists, spaces for "no" and "comment", nor the data at the top of each checklist. These additions for round #2 were arrived at after the practioner's conference with all the participants after round #1.

Subject:_____ ObserVEE:_____

Grade level:_____ ObserVER:_____

No. of students:_____ class period #_____

## OBSERVATIONAL CHECKLIST

| | YES | NO | COMMENT |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. The main points of the lesson are easily identifiable. | ___ | ___ | _____ |
| 2. Teacher's goals (what he's going to do with this material and what he wants students to do with it) are easily identifiable. | ___ | ___ | _____ |
| 3. Teacher handles discipline problems directly, postively, & effectively. | ___ | ___ | _____ |
| 4. Teacher's rate of teaching doesn't lose or bore students. | ___ | ___ | _____ |
| 5. Teacher appeals to more than one of the 5 senses in teaching ( i.e., makes use of illustrative materials and techniques). | ___ | ___ | _____ |
| 6. Students ask questions to discuss or clarify material. | ___ | ___ | _____ |
| 7. Teacher keeps students' attention by interesting conversational manner rather than by quickening rate of teaching. | ___ | ___ | _____ |
| 8. Teacher treats all students equally. | ___ | ___ | _____ |
| 9. Teacher shows a positive image of his role. | ___ | ___ | _____ |
| 10. Teacher shows respect for student opinion and suggestion. | ___ | ___ | _____ |
| 11. Teacher has full, unquestioned control of the classroom. | ___ | ___ | _____ |
| 12. Teacher possesses a wealth of commentary expressions. | ___ | ___ | _____ |
| 13. Teacher asks thought-provoking questions (i.e., not just a recall of material) | ___ | ___ | _____ |

| | YES | NO | COMMENT |
|---|---|---|---|
| 14. Teacher reinforces good student performance. | ___ | ___ | _____ |
| 15. Teacher does not over-discipline students for bad performance. | ___ | ___ | _____ |
| 16. Teacher interacts with students (i.e. does not lecture all of the time.) | ___ | ___ | _____ |

Use Space Below for any additional observational data that could be discussed in the conference following this observation.

Subject:_____ ObserVEE:_____

Grade Level:_____ ObserVER:_____

No. of Students:_____ Class Period#_____

## OBSERVER'S FEEDBACK CHECKLIST

| | YES | NO | COMMENT |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. I had a pro-conference with the observee to gain a mutual understanding of the points on the observational checklist related to his performance (so he knew what I'd be looking for). | ___ | ___ | _____ |
| 2. The observee showed an understanding or the observational checklist's points as educational writing has defined each point. | ___ | ___ | _____ |
| 3. I felt like a judge instead of a "mirror" as I observed him. | ___ | ___ | _____ |
| 4. The observee was uncomfortable while I observed him. | ___ | ___ | _____ |
| 5. The observee accepted positively the data recorded on the observational checklist. | ___ | ___ | _____ |
| 6. I found it easy to observe using the checklist as a guide. | ___ | ___ | _____ |
| 7. I thought the checklist was adequate. | ___ | ___ | _____ |
| 8. I learned something from observing. If yes, specify below: | ___ | ___ | _____ |
| 9. I felt adequately informed and prepared for this experience. | ___ | ___ | _____ |
| 10. I feel that this kind of intra-departmental observation should be done quarterly as a matter of policy in the future. | ___ | ___ | _____ |

Subject:_____ ObserVEE:_____

Grade Level:_____ ObserVER:_____

No. of students:_____ Class Period #_____

OBSERVEE'S FEEDBACK CHECKLIST

| | YES | NO | COMMENT |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. The observer and I reviewed the observational checklist before class to achieve a mutual understanding of each point. | ___ | ___ | _____ |
| 2. The observer showed an understanding of the observational checklist's points as educational writing has defined each point. | ___ | ___ | _____ |
| 3. I felt like the observer was a judge instead of a "mirror"during the observation. | ___ | ___ | _____ |
| 4. The observer was uncomfortable while observing me. | ___ | ___ | _____ |
| 5. I discovered something new about my teaching from the recorded observational data. If yes, specify: | ___ | ___ | _____ |
| 6. I thought the checklist was adequate. | ___ | ___ | _____ |
| 7. The observer was judgmental about my performance as he explained the data he observed in the postconference. | ___ | ___ | _____ |
| 8. I felt adequately informed and prepared for this experience. | ___ | ___ | _____ |
| 9. I feel that this kind of intra-departmental observation should be done quarterly as a matter of policy in the future. | ___ | ___ | _____ |

Conferences

McKean and Mills provide the rationale for the conferences needed to insure the successful implementation of this intra-departmental supervisory program. They insist that the supervisor, or implementor, must plan closely with the administration of the school in order to secure support and the necessary sanctions for schedule shifts and classroom visitations.[5] At Prep, both the headmaster and dean of studies gave their support and cooperation to the supervisory program all throughout its implementation. It was this practitioner, however, who actually worked out the free periods and schedule of observations for the participants, especially for the second round (4th quarter.)

McKean and Mills further stress the importance of the pre-conferences with the participants to insure their understanding of the purposes and nature of the supervisory process.[6] At Prep, this was done in two phases. The first was to explain the program and elicit the support of each of the seven participants; all seven eagerly supported the program. The second was to explain the elements of the checklists as they were distributed to each member. This served to insure a mutual understanding of the components by all the participants.

Then each observer was to have a pre-conference with his observee for each round to confirm that mutual understanding of the purposes and nature of the checklists. According to the feedback verbal comments

---

[5] Robert C. McKean, and H.H. Mills, The Supervisor (Washington, D.C.: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1964), p. 97.

[6] Ibid.

of the participants, these pre-conferences helped to make the evaluative post-conferences between observer and observee brief and to the point. McKean and Mills point up the necessity for these pre-and evaluative post-conferences to insure that both participants gain the most value from the experience.[7]

Finally, and in the same light the practitioner had a brief and pointed evaluative post-conference with each participant as he returned the completed checklists. These post-conferences helped the practitioner to make revisions of the checklists for round #2 and to evaluate summarily the experience for purposes of recommendation to the Prep administration.

Sequential Plan of Action

The major elements of this intra-departmental supervisory program at Prep have been thus far discussed in terms of their rationales, implications, and circumstances. All of these elements now fall together in the following nine-point plan of action:

1. Contact departmental members to elicit their support; the program was explained thoroughly to each department member and on an individual basis, reinforcing its worth when necessary in the course of its duration; each participant was to observe only one other colleague in each round.

2. Arrange schedules where necessary to permit intra-departmental observation; where substitute teachers were needed, they were contacted and arranged for personally by the practitioner.

3. Construct checklist for observation and feedback checklists for the observer and observee.

4. Issue checklists with instructions that they are to be returned to the innovator only for the purpose of program evaluation, not for administrative judgment of teacher; the checklists were explained point-by-point to each participant.

---

[7] Ibid.

5. Set a time limit for the conferences, observations, and checklists to be completed; a two week span was set for round #1 and a one week span was set for round #2 for reasons discussed above.

6. Review returned checklists and confer if clarification is necessary with those who have completed and experiment; suggestions for revising the checklists for round #2 were obtained after round #1.

7. Offer constructive comments to those having difficulty completing the experiment.

8. For round #2 repeat steps #2-7 using revised checklists.

9. Statistically evaluate the final feedback surveys for the purposes of formulating a recommendation to the administration as to the merits or demerits of this supervisory program's being a stated departmental procedure for the future.

## RESULTS

The purpose of this section of the report is not to display the number of "yes's", "no's", and "comments" per item of the observational checklist. Such a display was not a goal of this supervisory program. However, since the validity of the observational checklists has been established in the above discussion on these instruments, it remains to establish the reliability of the observational checklists. This can be done by noting the stability of response for the person most frequently observed in round #1 and then in round #2. To provide a foundation for the reliability indications, a professional profile of all seven participants is given first. Finally, the feedback checklists are examined to determine the frequency of positive and negative reactions, and those along with the positive comments from the post-conferences between the participants and this practitioner will contribute to the summative evaluation of the program and the subsequent recommendation to the Prep administration.

Professional Profile of Participants

Prior to the determination of the reliablity of an instrument, it is logical to establish the qualifications of the people who are using the instruments. If the user is to some degree knowledgeable in the subject which the instrument is measuring, then to that degree can the user be said to be qualified to use the instrument. For the purposes of this experiment, therefore, the professional status of each of the participants can be noted:

1. Fr. John Swoger: 10 years experinece, priest- teacher, B.A., grad, educ. credits, assistant headmaster, teaches 35 students, 11th grade, observed 0 students in round #1 ( was not able to find time ), observed 19 students of 11th grade in round #2.

2. Fr. James T. O'Hara: 7 years experience, priest-teacher, B.A., grad, educ. credits, teaches 180 students, 10th and 11th grades, observed 20 students of 9th grade in round #1, observed 30 students of 11th grade in round #2.

3. Fr. Gerald J. Koos: 7 years experience, priest-teacher, S.T.B. in Theology, M. Ed., guidance couselor, teaches 30 students, 11th grade observed 0 students in round #1 (was not able to find time) observed 37 students of 11th grade in round #2.

4. Fr. Daniel J. Kresinski: 3 years experience, priest-teacher, B.A.,S.T.B. in theology, grad. educ. credits, teaches 130 students, 9th grade, in round #1 observed 25 students of 9th grade, in round # 2, observed 31 students of 9th grade.

5. Fr. Robert L. Humenay: 4 years experinece, priest-teacher, M.A. in theology, teaches 135 students, 9th grade, observed 26 students of 9th grade in round #1, observed 22 students of 9th grade in round #2.

6. Fr. Frank Przepierski; — 2 years experience, priest-teacher, B.A. in theology, educ. credits, teaches 165 students, 10th grade, observed 28 students of 9th grade in round #1, observed 26 students of 9th grade in round # 2.

7. Fr. L. Thomas Snyderwine: — 5 years experience, priest-teacher, M.A. in educ. and theology, teaches 150 students, 11th grade, observed 26 students of 9th grade in round #1, observed 23 students of 9th grade in round #2.

The above credentials obviously, then, qualify the participants to use the instruments of this experiment with an insight into the subject being measured.

Reliability of Observational Checklists

The reliability of an instrument is the extent to which its operation gives similar results under similar conditions. This stability of results is, therefore, the criterion of reliability and can be determined by correlating successive operations of the same instrument under similar conditions.[8] For the purposes of this experiment the elements can be converted accordingly:

successive operations = different observers

of the same instrument = observing with checklists

under similar conditions = the same observee.

In the observations of round #1 (3rd quarter), it turned out that Father Humenay was observed more times than the other participants,

---

[8] John M. Gottman and Robert E. Clasen, Evlauation in Education, (Itasca, Ill.: F.E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1972), p. 303.

a total of 3 times. Father Humenay then becomes the "similar conditions" for the round #1 reliability test. Below are the tabulations for round #1's observational checklist observing Father Humenay 3 times:

OBSERVATIONAL CHECKLIST

| | | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | The main points of the lesson are easily identifiable. | 3 | 0 |
| 2. | Teacher's goals (what he's going to do with this material and what he wants students to do with it)are easily identifiable. | 3 | 0 |
| 3. | Teacher handles discipline problems directly, positively, and effectively. | 3 | 0 |
| 4. | Teacher's rate of teaching doesn't lose or bore students. | 3 | 0 |
| 5. | Teacher appeals to more than one of the five senses in teaching (ie. makes use of illustrative materials and techniques). | 3 | 0 |
| 6. | Students ask questions to discuss or clarify material. | 3 | 0 |
| 7. | Teacher keeps students' attention by interesting conversational manner rather than by quickening the rate of teaching. | 3 | 0 |
| 8. | Teacher treats all students equally and fairly. | 3 | 0 |
| 9. | Teacher shows a positive image of his role. | 3 | 0 |
| 10. | Teacher shows respect for student opinion and suggestions. | 2 | 1 |
| 11. | Teacher has full, <u>unquestioned</u> control of the classroom. | 3 | 0 |
| 12. | Teacher possesses a wealth of commentary expressions. | 3 | 0 |
| 13. | Teacher asks thought-provoking questions (ie. not just a recall of material). | 1 | 2 |
| 14. | Teacher reinforces good student performance. | 1 | 2 |
| 15. | Teacher does not over-discipline students for bad performance. | 3 | 0 |
| 16. | Teacher interacts with students (ie. does not lecture all of the time). | 3 | 0 |

In general, there is stability of consensus, and it happens to occur in the "yes" column. Items # 10, # 13, and # 14 show some variance. However, these variances were verified by Father Humenay in a post-conference. Therefore, according to Gottman and Clasen's concept of reliability, the observational checklist of round #1 can be said to be reliable.

In the observations of round #2 (4th quarter), it turned out that Father Kresinski was observed more times than the other participants, a total of 3 times. Father Kresinski than becomes the "similar conditions" for the round #2 reliability test. Below are the tabulations for round #2's observational checklist observing Father Kresinski 3 times:

OBSERVATIONAL CHECKLIST

| | YES | NO | COMMENT |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. The main points of the lesson are easily identifiable. | 3 | 0 | |
| 2. Teacher's goals (what he's going to do with this material and what he wants students to do with it) are easily identifiable. | 3 | 0 | |
| 3. Teacher handles discipline problems directly, positively, & effectively | 3 | 0 | |
| 4. Teacher's rate of teaching doesn't lose or bore students. | 2 | 1 | |
| 5. Teacher appeals to more than one of the 5 senses in teaching (i.e., makes use of illustrative materials and techniques). | 2 | 1 | |
| 6. Students ask questions to discuss or clarify material. | 3 | 0 | |
| 7. Teacher keeps students' attention by interesting conversational manner rather than by quickening rate of teaching. | 1 | 2 | |
| 8. Teacher treats all students equally. | 3 | 0 | |
| 9. Teacher shows a postive image of his role. | 3 | 0 | |
| 10. Teacher shows respect for student opinion and suggestion. | 3 | 0 | |
| 11. Teacher has full, unquestioned control of the classroom. | 3 | 0 | |
| 12. Teacher possesses a wealth of commentary expressions. | 3 | 0 | |

| | YES | NO | COMMENT |
|---|---|---|---|
| 13. Teacher asks thought-provoking questions (i.e., not just a recall of material). | 2 | 1 | |
| 14. Teacher reinforces good student performance. | 2 | 1 | |
| 15. Teacher does not over-discipline students for bad performance. | 3 | 0 | |
| 16. Teacher interacts with students (i.e., does not lecture all of the time). | 3 | 0 | |

Again, in general there is stability of consensus, and it happens to occur in the "yes" column. Items #4, #5, #7, #13, and #14 show some variance. And like Father Humenay in round #1, Fr. Kresinski accounted for these variances in round #2 in a post-conference. The addition of "comment" space seemed to help practitioner and observee verify the variances since most observers commented on "no" items. Therefore, according to Gottman and Clasen again, the observational checklist of round #2 can be said to be reliable.

Feedback Checklists

Examination of the feedback checklists for round #1 reveals that all five participants found the intra-departmnetal supervisory experience to be very positive except for two of the participants and then only in one area of the program. Below are the tabulations of the feedback checklists for round #1.

OBSERVER'S FEEDBACK CHECKLIST

| | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|
| 1. I had a pre-conference with the observee to gain a mutual understanding of the points on the observational checklist related to his performance (so he knew what I would be looking for). | 5 | 0 |
| 2. The observee showed an understanding of the observational checklist's points as educational writing has defined each point. | 5 | 0 |
| 3. I felt like a judge instead of a "mirror" as I observed him. | 2 | 3 |
| 4. The observee was uncomfortable during my observation. | 0 | 5 |
| 5. The observee accepted positively the data recorded on the observational checklist. | 5 | 0 |
| 6. I found it easy to observe using the checklist as a guide. | 5 | 0 |
| 7. I thought the checklist was adequate. | 5 | 0 |
| 8. I learned something from observing. If yes, specify; | 5 | 0 |
| 9. I felt adequately informed and prepared for this experience. | 5 | 0 |

OBSERVEE'S FEEDBACK CHECKLIST

| | | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | The observer and I reviewed the observational checklist before class to acheive a mutual understanding of each point. | 5 | 0 |
| 2. | The observer showed an understanding of the observational checklist's points as educational writing has defined each point. | 5 | 0 |
| 3. | I felt like the observer was a judge instead of a "mirror" during the observation. | 0 | 5 |
| 4. | The observer was uncomfortable during my observation. | 0 | 5 |
| 5. | I discovered something new about my teaching from the recorded observational data. If yes, specify: | 5 | 0 |
| 6. | I thought the checklist was adequate. | 5 | 0 |
| 7. | The observer was judgemental about my performance as he explained the data he observed in the post-conference. | 0 | 5 |
| 8. | I felt adequately informed and prepared for this experience. | 5 | 0 |

As can be seen from the above indications, two observers felt that they were in a judging role rather than a reflecting role during the observation. A post-conference with this practitioner after round #1 corrected their perspective before the beginning of round #2.

The feedback checklists for round #2 were revised as per suggestions and determined needs following the post-conferences of round #1. Examination of the feedback checklists for round #2 reveals that for the most part, all seven participants found the second round of the intra-departmental supervisory experience to be very positive with some variances. Below are the feedback tabulations for round #2.

OBSERVER'S FEEDBACK CHECKLIST

| | | YES | NO | COMMENT |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | I had a pre-conference with the observee to gain a mutual understanding of the points on the observational checklist realted to his performance (so he knew what I'd be looking for.) | 6 | 1 | |
| 2. | The observee showed an understanding of the observational checklists points as educational writing has defined each point. | 7 | 0 | |
| 3. | I felt like a judge instead of a "mirror" as I observed him. | 0 | 7 | |
| 4. | The observee was uncomfortable while I observed him. | 1 | 6 | |
| 5. | The observee accepted positively the data recorded on the observational checklist. | 7 | 0 | |
| 6. | I found it easy to observe using the checklist as a guide. | 7 | 0 | |
| 7. | I thought the checklist was adequate. | 7 | 0 | |
| 8. | I learned something from observing. If yes, specify below: | 4 | 3 | |
| 9. | I felt adequately informed and prepared for this experience. | 7 | 0 | |
| 10. | I feel that this kind of intra-departmental observation should be done quarterly as a matter of policy in the future. | 6 | 1 | |

## OBSERVEE'S FEEDBACK CHECKLIST

| | | YES | NO | COMMENT |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | The observer and I reviewed the observational checklist before class to achieve a mutual understanding of each point. | 6 | 1 | |
| 2. | The observer showed an understanding of the observational checklist's points as educational writing had defined each point. | 7 | 0 | |
| 3. | I felt like the observer was a judge instead of a "mirror" during the observation. | 0 | 7 | |
| 4. | The observer was uncomfortable while observing me. | 0 | 7 | |
| 5. | I discovered something new about my teaching from the recorded observational data. If yes, specify: | 5 | 2 | |
| 6. | I thought the checklist was adequate. | 7 | 0 | |
| 7. | The observer was judgmental about my performance as he explained the data he observed in the post-conference. | 0 | 7 | |
| 8. | I felt adequately informed and prepared for this experience. | 7 | 0 | |
| 9. | I feel that this kind of intra-departmental observation should be done quarterly as a matter of policy in the future. | 7 | 0 | |

As can be seen from the indications above there was one case ( item #1 ) where the observer and observee were not able to have a pre-conference. In post-conference with the practitioner, they indicated that schedule difficulty was the cause of the problem. Also, one observer ( item #4 ) felt the observee was uncomfortable during the observation. However, the observee did not substantiate that hunch as can be seen on item #4 of the observee's checklist.

The fact that there is a wider variance than in round #1 in the items specifying new knowledge about teaching is explainable in a couple ways. Post-conferences revealed that while the participants observed different people in round #2 then they did in round #1, round #2 came at a "review" time of the 4th quarter. Therefore, actual teaching was somewhat curtailed. Likewise, some participants just simply did not learn anything <u>new</u> about themselves or from their observed colleague.

Finally, all but one participant felt that the experiment should become a quarterly procedure in the future. In post-conference, the one dissenter did support the program, but thought perhaps once a semester would be sufficient.

Specific comments from the participants on points which they learned about themselves and from others readily fulfilled the goal of the program to provide a clearinghouse for the exchange of ideas and classroom approaches. The written comments on the checklists fall into the following general categories:

A. Things learned about self
    1. rate is too fast
    2. reassurance from observer is therapeutic
    3. tendency to misspell on chalkboard and to confuse names of students

4. greater tolerance for student energies than previously thought
5. classroom spontaneity increases when being observed
6. too many examples can bore students
7. too many recall questions and not enough thought questions
8. change is slow and hard.

B. Things learned from others.
1. many sytles can get same point across
2. good use of inductive method
3. sincere non-defensive interaction with students
4. how to have a relaxed atmosphere in class
5. good approach to discipline in a large class
6. good material organization in class presentation
7. dialogue with students regarding tests.

This concludes the evaluative measures for this Intra-departmental Supervisory Program at Cathedral Prep. The rationale has been stated, the need and goals have been determined and they have for the most part been met as far as the scope of this experiment extends. The elements of the above evaluation are the framework of the following recommendation to the Cathedral Prep administration.

RECOMMENDATION TO ADMINISTRATION

Rev. L. Thomas Snyderwine
7615 Wattsburg Road
Erie, PA 16509

June 28, 1973

Rev. John M. Dollinger, Headmaster
Cathedral Prep School
225 West 9 St.
Erie, PA 16501

Dear Father Dollinger:

Three months ago I proposed to you the introduction of an intra-departmental supervisory program as a formal and recurrent program of instruction improvement at Cathedral Prep. You approved the proposal and my request to use the department of theology as the initial test area.

Now I am able to report to you the results of the experiment. There were two phases of the experiment, one in the 3rd quarter, and one in the 4th quarter incorporating the improvements over the 3rd quarter's attempt. While there were constructive improvements for the 4th quarter, the participants, all theology faculty, reacted very favorably to the program in both phases.

According to the design of the program, all felt adequately prepared for the experiment. All understood the terms of the checklists used, and felt that the checklists were adequate. Most all seemed to approach the experience in a colleagal, non-threatening manner. Thus, the program accomplished the first of its goals: to help a teacher to view his teaching practice in light of some established good teaching habits.

The second goal of the program was to provide a basis for the exchange of ideas and classroom approaches among the participating teachers. This too was accomplished as evidenced by the specific comments from the participants on the points which they learned about themselves and from others. The most significant of these results can be categorized in this way:

A. Things learned about self
   1. rate is too fast
   2. reassurance from observer is therapeutic
   3. too many examples can bore students
   4. not enough thought questions used
   5. change is slow and difficult

B. Things learned from others
   1. many styles can get the same point across
   2. a good use of the inductive method
   3. a sincere, non-defensive interaction with students
   4. a good approach to discipline in a large class
   5. a good organization of material for class presentation

Each of the above ten points when considered seriously by any teacher can only lead to the improvement of instruction. It was through this experiment that the participating teachers became practically aware of them.

Therefore, I offer these results by way of recommendation that this program become a stated part of the Prep policy on a basis to be determined by each department. Six of the seven participants felt that the procedure should be implemented on a quarterly basis; one felt that once a semester would be sufficient.

A complete report of this experiment for your reference accompanies this recommendation. Likewise, I am available at any time for consultation on this matter. Thanking you for your cooperation and support, I remain

Sincerely yours,

Rev. L. Thomas Snyderwine
Associate in Curriculum Development
Cathedral Prep School, Erie, PA

pf

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, Harold P., and Dickey, Frank G. Basic Principles of Supervision. New York: American Book Co., 1953.

Barr, A.S., et al. Teacher Effectiveness. Madison, Wis.: Dembar Publications, Inc., 1961.

Beecher, Dwight E. The Evaluation of Teaching.Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1949.

Combs, Arthus W. "The Personal Approach to Good Teaching," Educational Leadership, XXI (March, 1964), 369-377.

Franseth, Jane. Supervision as Leadership.Evanston, Ill.: Row, Peterson and Company, 1961.

Garrett, Henry E. Statistics in Psychology and Education. 5th ed. New York: David McKay, Co., Inc., 1965.

Gottman John M., and Clasen, Robert E. Evaluation in Education. Itasca, Ill.: F.E. Peacock, Publishers, Inc., 1972.

Gwynn, J. Minor. Theory and Practice of Supervision. New York: Dodd, Mead, and Company, 1961.

McKean, Robert C., and Mills, H.H. The Supervisor. Washington, D.C.: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1964.

Neagley, Ross L., and Evans, N. Dean. Handbook for Effective Supervision of Instruction. 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.

Pittenger, Gary E. Educational Supervision. Ed. D. Study Guide. Fort Lauderdale, Fla.: Nova University, 1972.